

**REMARKS**

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on April 2, 2003, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 6, 16, and 17 are amended, no claims are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-27 are pending in this application.

**Claim Objections**

Claim 6 was objected to because of informalities. The objection states that “The word ‘is’ between ‘stop’ and ‘attached’ should be deleted.

Pursuant to the Examiner’s suggestion, claim 6 has been amended. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claim 6 is respectfully requested.

**§112 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 25-27 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The rejection stated that, ”the claims recite a method including forming (manufacturing) an electronic module, a display unit, and a flexible guide. The specification does not disclose methods of manufacturing these devices, and is therefore not enabling of the claims.”

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Applicant notes that “manufacturing” is discussed in the specification on page 4, lines 16-23.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art, with the benefit of the present specification would be enabled within the scope of claims 25-27 to manufacture devices given the level of detail of the “apparatus” in the detailed description section. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC § 112, first paragraph rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

The rejection stated that the limitation “the flexible guide frame” in line 2 of the claim does not have correct antecedent basis. Applicant has amended claim 17 to cure the antecedent basis issues. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC § 112, second paragraph rejection is respectfully requested.

*§103 Rejection of the Claims*

Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over a published Japanese patent application to Katsuji (JP-2001-190010) in view of various combinations with Cronin (U.S. Pat. No. 4,493,146), Oikawa (U.S. Pat. No. 4,871,134), and Long (U.S. Pat. No. 5,534,665).

Applicant respectfully traverses the statement from page 5, line 10 of the present Office Action that an aircraft instrument panel “would inherently include a flat panel screen as the display device.” Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue distinguishing features of a flat panel screen at a later date. However, Applicant submits that Katsuji is distinguishable, as described below.

The rejection states:

Cronin does not disclose a flexible guide that limits communication line movement to substantially a two dimensional plane. Katsuji et al. disclose a flexible guide (2) that protects the communication line (1) and limits communication line movement to substantially a two dimensional plane. In particular, the portions of the protector of Katsuji et al. designated as 11a-11c and 14a -14c would, when locked together, limit movement to a substantially a two dimensional plane by the action of the hinges (14h and 14g).

Katsuji appears to show portions 11a – 11c of a body 3, and mating portions 14a – 14c. Katsuji also appears to show hinges 14h and 14g as part of cover 4. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the guide 2 of Katsuji does not guide any communication line **movement**. Hinges 14h and 14g appear to be used to permit the cover 4 to conform to a solid and fixed three dimensional body 3. Once the cover 4 is attached to the body 3, the guide 2 as a

unit does not permit any movement, and in contrast fixes a location of the guide 2 in three dimensions. In contrast, independent claims 1, 7, 14, 21, and 25 include a flexible guide limits communication line **movement** to substantially a **two dimensional plane**.

Applicant agrees with the Examiner that “Cronin does not disclose a flexible guide that limits communication line movement to substantially a two dimensional plane.” Applicant respectfully submits that the additional references of Oikawa and Long fail to cure the deficiencies of Katsugi and Cronin as outlined above.

Because the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not show every element of Applicant's independent claims, a 35 USC § 103(a) rejection is not supported by the references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested with respect to Applicant's independent claims 1, 7, 14, 21, and 25. Additionally, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested with respect to the remaining claims that depend therefrom as depending on allowable base claims.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (612-373-6944) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743

Respectfully submitted,


BRIAN F. RUFF ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(612) 373-6944

Date 7-2-03


By

  
David C. Peterson  
Reg. No. 47,857

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O.Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 2 day of July, 2003.

Candis B. Buending

Name

  
Signature